

**United States Court of Appeals**  
**FOR THE EIGHTH CIRCUIT**

---

No. 98-2167

---

United States of America,

Appellee,

v.

Green Harris Buford,

Appellant.

\*

\*

\*

\*

\*

\*

\*

\*

\*

Appeal from the United States

District Court for the Eastern District of

Arkansas.

[UNPUBLISHED]

---

Submitted: September 22, 1998

Filed: October 6, 1998

---

Before BEAM, LAY, and LOKEN, Circuit Judges.

---

PER CURIAM.

Green Harris Buford was charged in a two-count indictment with conspiracy to distribute and possession with intent to distribute cocaine, a Class A felony, in violation of 21 U.S.C. §§ 841 and 846, and use of a communication facility in the commission of a drug felony, a Class E felony, in violation of 21 U.S.C. § 843(b). Following a jury trial in federal district court,<sup>1</sup> Buford was found guilty on both counts. The district court denied Buford's motion for acquittal or, in the alternative, a motion for a new trial and

---

<sup>1</sup>The Honorable Henry Woods, United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Arkansas, presiding.

sentenced him to a term of 225 months on count one and 48 months on count two, each count to run concurrently for a total of 225 months.

On appeal, Buford raises four evidentiary and trial-related issues which he claims constitute reversible error. Specifically, he argues that: (1) the trial judge committed error by allowing into evidence a monitored telephone conversation between Buford and government witness Harold Barbee; (2) the trial judge committed error by allowing into evidence the testimony of another government witness, Cedric Brewer, as to what Harold Barbee told him about Buford; (3) the prosecution's delay in providing Buford's counsel with Cedric Brewer's statement violated the rule of Brady v. Maryland; and (4) the trial judge improperly commented on the evidence in responding to a hearsay objection.

Having carefully reviewed the parties' briefs and their submissions on appeal, we find no error that would require reversal. Because an extensive discussion of Buford's fact-specific arguments is not warranted, we affirm the district court judgment without a comprehensive opinion. See 8th Cir. R. 47B. We similarly deny Buford's motion to hold this ruling in abeyance pending the appeal of another case.

A true copy.

Attest:

CLERK, U.S. COURT OF APPEALS, EIGHTH CIRCUIT.